



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,773	12/11/2001	Hannu Konttinen	413-010727-US(PAR)	9944
2512	7590	09/22/2006	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824				LUDWIG, MATTHEW J
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,773	KONTTINEN, HANNU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed 6/23/2006.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 14, and 15, are independent claims. Applicant added new independent claim 15.
3. Claims 1-14 remain rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette in view of Warnock have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. **Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al., USPN 5,623,679 filed (4/18/1995) in view of Warnock et al., USPN 5,634,064 filed (8/2/1996).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Rivette teaches:

Figure 10 illustrates a preprocessing of pages in order to display the text portion to a user for a method of extracting, synchronizing, displaying, and manipulating text and image documents in electronic form (compare to “*preprocessing the pages in order to display the text portion in them*”). See Rivette, Figure 10.

Figure 30 illustrates a display divided into a navigation pane and a read pane. The two panes contain location identifiers for various sections of the equivalent file displayed (compare to “*dividing the display into a navigation pane and a read pane*”). See Rivette, figure 30.

The third limitation contains the phrase ‘overall view’. The examiner fails to see how this description of a view distinguishes over the suggested view presented in Figure 30 of Rivette. The reference provides an overall view of the document in the navigation pane or the left pane. See Rivette, figure 30. The examiner believes the reference provides a suggestion of an overall view, as presently claimed, with the view of the patent document presented within figure 30.

As presently claimed, the language specific rules fail to distinguish over the prior art reference to Rivette. Without any further mention of the language specific rules within the claim, the language fails to preclude the examiner from utilizing the patent numbers illustrated in figure 30 as a way to search the text, based upon language specific rules. The language specific rules would have been taught by the information found in the patent number **4,760,478 Column: B1 of 6**. Finally, the limitation fails to state how the searching is being accomplished or if the machine, user, or a parser performs the searching.

4,760,478 Column: 3 of 6, as illustrated in figure 31 is selectable by the user (compare to “*selecting the text portion between the start element and end element as the reading portion and placing the selected portion on the read pane*”). See Rivette, figure 31. After selecting a specific portion of the document the text is presented to the user in the read pane. The start and element as presently claimed is suggested by the document that is brought into focus after the selection has been made.

Finally, the reference provides arrow keys and drop down menus for searching new start and end elements. See Rivette, figure 31. However, the reference fails to explicitly state searching for a new start element and end element if a *shift command is received*. Warnock provides a type of scroll that allows a reader to scroll around in the current page. The computer's operating system or the presentation manager typically controls this. The scrolling mechanism allows the user to shift through the document based on simple keyboard features. The scrolling mechanism provides a similar result as that of a search for new start element and end element if a shift command is received. Furthermore, the reference discloses the employment of a hot key for providing article properties. The utilization of the shift key to implement the functions of a hot key was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rivette and Warnock before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the search methods of Rivette to include hot keys to shift through any type of patent document, because it would have allowed the user enhanced readability of specific patent sections.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Rivette teaches:

Figure 36 allows for start element to be defined within a drop down menu. This provides the user an efficient way to select and locate text within the patent document. See Rivette, figure 36. A user could base the start element on punctuation mark, number, text, etc.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Rivette teaches:

Figure 36 allows for start element to be defined within a drop down menu. This provides the user an efficient way to select and locate text within the patent document. See Rivette, figure 36. A user could base the start element on punctuation mark, number, text, etc.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Rivette teaches:

The reference provides arrow keys and drop down menus for searching new start and end elements. See Rivette, figure 31. However, the reference fails to explicitly state searching for a new start element and end element if a *shift command is received*. Warnock provides a type of scroll that allows a reader to scroll around in the current page. The computer's operating system or the presentation manager typically controls this. The scrolling mechanism allows the user to shift through the document based on simple keyboard features. The scrolling mechanism provides a similar result as that of a search for new start element and end element if a shift command is received. Furthermore, the reference discloses the employment of a hot key for providing article properties. The utilization of the shift key to implement the functions of a hot key was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rivette and Warnock before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the search methods of Rivette to include hot keys to shift through any type of patent document, because it would have allowed the user enhanced readability of specific patent sections.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Rivette teaches:

Figure 36 allows for start element to be defined within a drop down menu. This provides the user an efficient way to select and locate text within the patent document. See Rivette, figure 36. A user could base the start element on punctuation mark, number, text, etc.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Rivette teaches:

Figure 31 illustrates the selected portion being determined by column: 3 of 6. This suggests the reading portion being a selectable parameter. Furthermore, the arrow keys beside the patent also suggest a means of selecting a parameter being read. See Rivette, figure 31.

In reference to claims 7-15, the claims recite similar limitations to those recited in claims 1-6.

In view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant describes the application as one directed to a solution for the problem of viewing large HTML files on a small screen. It provides a means by which 'a full page can be viewed on a navigation screen and permits the scrolling and selection of small portions of the page with start and end elements defined according to language rules. The language rules relate to the syntax of written language language, for example punctuation, conjunctives, and connecting parts of sentences. The applicant believes this is clearly described in independent claims 1, 7, 14, and new claim 15.

The examiner disagrees with the applicant and believes the independent claims fails to accurately claim sufficient language that is being argued within the proposed amendment. More specifically, there is no description of how the searching is being performed within the text and without sufficient claim language to describe what 'language specific rules' actually means, the limitations do not preclude the examiner from utilizing the Rivette reference to teach and/or

suggest the search of a reference beginning with a title (start element) and ending with a period (end element). Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the limitation ‘searching the text, based on language specific rules’ fails to describe who is searching the text, how the text is being search, i.e. processor, user, what defines language specific rules.

Applicant states the Rivette reference fails to teach dividing the display into a navigation pane and a read pane. Furthermore, applicant states the disclosure of Rivette at column 34, lines 12-27 indicates that the display is divided between an image (graphic) file and a text file, both of which provide navigation. The terms navigation and read pane as disclosed within the Rivette reference may be interchangeable, however, the suggestion of two distinct panes for navigation and viewing is taught by the Rivette reference.

Finally, the Examiner believes the start element and end element as disclosed within the limitations of the independent claims fail to make clear what exactly is defined as a start/end element. If a user is searching the text of a relevant document and doing so based upon the language rules disclosed within the document than what he/she determines as a start/end element is arbitrary and could be punctuation mark, number, etc. Therefore, the reference discloses start/end elements based upon the arrow keys and drop down menus for searching relevant content.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER